

REMARKS

The Official Action of August 1, 2008, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 15-30, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-14 have been cancelled in favor of new claims 15-30.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings, Applicant notes that elongated holes 22 are clearly depicted in Fig. 5. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection is now moot.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant has canceled claims 1-14 in favor of new claims 15-30, which have been drafted to eliminate each of the problems identified in cancelled claims 1-14. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has now been overcome.

Applicant respectfully traverses all of the prior art rejections of the claims found on pages 5 through 13.

The patent to Fulterer is directed to a mounting hardware for a tall-cabinet pullout. It also shows only one adjustment screw (15), but with this screw it is not possible to adjust the height of the central frame (40). With this screw, only the angle of the frame in respect to the lower telescopic rail can be adjusted, as the frame is pivoted on the telescoping rail about the axis of a bolt (36) (see Col. 7, lines 57-59). Simply adding a second screw would also not lead to the height adjustment function provided by the two adjustment screws.

Appln. No. 10/534,716
Amdt. dated November 3, 2008
Reply to Office Action of August 1, 2008

Further, neither Fulterer nor Bowzer teach a screw head, which is used as the catch for a locking latch.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention patentably defines over the cited prior art on the basis of the structural differences between the cited prior art and the claimed invention identified above.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\B\Back\sage14\Pto\2008-11-03-Amendment.doc